



3:70-cv-4211-H

**Annual Report of the External Court Auditor
on the
Court Ordered Desegregation of the Dallas Independent School District
2001-2002
(CA 3-4211-H)**

**Submitted to
United States District Court
For The Northern District Court
Dallas Division**

October 16, 2002

4529

**Annual Report of the External Court Auditor
on the
Court Ordered Desegregation of the Dallas Independent School District
2001-2002
(CA 3-4211-H)**

**Audit Team
of
Malone And Associates, Inc.**

**Sandra D. Malone, Auditor
Adrian P. Jenkins, Data Specialist
Karen D. O'Neal, Data Specialist**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
1.0 Student Transfer Programs.....	2
2.0 Magnet Schools Program.....	7
3.0 Special Programs for the Academically Talented Students (Honors Programs)....	19
4.0 Programmatic Remedies.....	22
Planning Guide	
Reading Improvement	
Title I	
5.0 Early Childhood.....	29
6.0 Bilingual and ESOL Program.....	32
7.0 Learning Centers.....	35
8.0 Facilities/Bond Program.....	45
9.0 Personnel and Training.....	47

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Sending and Receiving Statistics by Individual Schools.....	3
Table 2	Sending and Receiving Statistics by Individual Schools.....	4
Table 3	Magnet Schools Percent Enrollment of All Grades in 1994-95 and 2002-2003.....	8
Table 4	Number of Tuition Students.....	14
Table 5	Analysis of Ethnic Representation in Pre-AP, Pre-Honors & TAG.....	8
Table 6	Learning Center Opening Day Status Report 2002.....	63

Introduction

The July 1994 Memorandum Opinion and Order Regarding Unitary Status and the 1987 Annotated Amended Judgment require the External Court Auditor to submit an annual report to the Court. The report is expected to respond to issues presented by the Dallas Independent School District in reports submitted twice annually. The auditor's report either validates, or identifies concerns about, the district's reported implementation of Court-ordered programs and the progress towards compliance with the mandates of the Court. A significant portion of this report is a response to the DISD September 16, 2002 Court Report-Part I and Part II on the following:

- ♦ Magnet Schools
- ♦ Bilingual/ESL
- ♦ Learning Centers
- ♦ Early Childhood Education
- ♦ 2002-2003 Planning Guide
- ♦ Programmatic Remedies
- ♦ Title One
- ♦ Reading Improvement

The auditor's report includes comments on the adequacy of the materials presented as documentation of compliance with the Court Order. Also, inconsistencies and omissions of essential data revealed by comparisons of the 2002 report and the 2001 report are noted.

Other parts of this report respond to information presented in the DISD February 15, 2002 Court Report on

- ♦ Facilities/Bond Program
- ♦ Student Transfer Program
- ♦ Special Programs for Academically Talented Students
- ♦ Personnel and Training

In the preparation of the report, data collected in seventy-two site visits confirm congruence or document variances in school-level and district-level reported information.

1.0 Student Transfer Program

Majority to Minority Transfer Program

The continuation of the Majority-to Minority Transfer program was mandated in the *July 1994 Memorandum Opinion and Order Regarding Unitary Status* at 20. The guidelines for program implementation include specifics related to eligibility, incentives, publicity and transportation, and are found in the *1987 Annotated Amended Judgment*.

Annually, the district is required to report the enrollment figures of new and returning M-to-M transfer students to the Court. The 2001-2002 enrollment figures presented in the *February 2001 Report to the Court*-Appendix C, show 503 students, an decrease from the previous year's 508. It is interesting to note that the number of schools eligible increased with the opening of Victor Hexter, which was previously closed for the 2000-2001 school year. The 508 student transfers recorded in 2000-2001 were from five of the ten schools eligible to receive M-to-M students. The 503 student transfers reported for 2001-2002 were from six of the ten schools eligible to receive M-to-M transfer students. Students who opt to participate in the transfer program are ethnic minority—primarily African American, Hispanic and American Indian. The following chart shows the number, percentage and ethnicity of high school students who participated in the M-to-M program for 2001-2002. Seagoville High School was the only high school open to receive ethnic minority students. As you will note, Spruce and Samuel High Schools contributed a total of 180 ethnic minority students to the 1186 student population of Seagoville High School. The same trend has prevailed for three years with Spruce sending 115 students in 2000-2001, 64 students in 1999-2000 and 46 students in 1998-1999; Samuel sent a smaller number in all three years—30 in 2000-2001, 21 in 1999-2000 and 15 in 1998-1999.

Table 1
Sending and Receiving Statistics by Individual Schools

Seagoville High M-M Transfers 2001-2002					
	AA	H	AS	A	Total
Adamson	0	1	0	0	1
Carter	3	2	0	0	5
Kimball	0	1	0	0	1
Lincoln	1	0	0	0	1
Madison	1	0	0	0	1
Roosevelt	3	0	0	0	3
Samuell	27	4	0	0	31
Skyline	0	7	0	0	7
Smith	3	0	0	0	3
SOC	1	0	0	0	1
Spruce	48	99	0	2	149
Sunset	0	1	0	0	1
Total	86	86	0	6	204

The absence of White students is noted in a study of the chart. Although White students make up only 7.2 % of the population of the total district and are the ethnic minority in all comprehensive high schools except Seagoville, few, if any, elect to participate in the M-to-M program despite the amenities associated. It appears that the college tuition is not a drawing card. The majority of the ethnic minority students eligible for tuition credits fail to utilize them—so this incentive is obviously not a drawing card for them either. Asian students, likewise, did not take advantage of the program in 2001-2002. The district may find it helpful to survey current M-to-M participants to determine what interested them in the program. Further, the figures presented in Table 7 of the *February 2002 Report to the Court* seem to confirm that it is not the tuition incentive, since only 14.8% of the \$341,600 earned by eligible students (1996-2001) was expended; and only 135 of the of the 605 eligible students applied for the scholarship award during the period 1996-2001.

Table 2
Sending and Receiving Statistics by Individual Schools

Seagoville Middle M-M Transfers 2001-02					
	AA	JA	AS	AI	Total
Comstock	30	91	0	0	121
Florence	16	22	0	0	38
Gaston	2	2	0	0	4
Hood	2	6	0	0	8
Long	1	0	0	0	1
Storey	0	1	0	0	1
Hulcy	1	1	0	0	2
Zumwalt	1	0	0	0	1
Total	61	133	0	3	176

At the middle school level, Seagoville Middle School is the single middle school open to ethnic minority students who opt to participate in the M-to-M program. Comstock and Florence Middle Schools together account for 159 students of the 790 Seagoville Middle School student population. Both Comstock and Florence have sent the most students for the past three years—Comstock sent 138 in 2000-2001, 117 in 1999-2000 and 35 in 1998-1999. Florence sent a much smaller number—33 in 2000-2001, 23 in 1999-2000 and 10 in 1998-1999.

At the elementary level, the 123 M-to-M program transfers are from a wider group of contributing schools. Foster and Rowe Elementary were the largest contributors for the 2001-2002 school year--both sending 9 students.

The July 1994 Memorandum Opinion and Order Regarding Unitary Status clearly requires the provision of specified incentives, and additional services to transfer students and their parents. As stated in previous auditor's reports, little information validating the actual provision of *additional and targeted* services is provided in the district's general reports to the Court. Further, no special reports are submitted by the district's Desegregation Monitor, nor

by the Counseling and/or Fine Arts Departments--who bear the responsibilities for providing incentives for students and parents. The auditor has, in past reports, questioned:

- ♦ whether ombudsman services are provided to parents
- ♦ whether counselor records for transfer students are used by school personnel to improve and increase the services of the M-to-M transfer program

Additionally, the auditor has questioned the lack of information on

- ♦ the level of parent involvement of transfer students
- ♦ the level of participation of elementary transfer students in free music lessons

Although the February 15, 2002 Court Report includes responses to three of the four items listed above, the information presented is inadequate to determine compliance

1. The entries in Table 3, *Campus Survey of Parent Involvement:2001-2002 M-M Transfer Students*, represent opportunities available for all parents. In most instances, the information does not specify the actual involvement of M-to-M parents. Activities such as parent conferences and PTA do not quantify membership or verify actual attendance.
2. The entries in Table 4, *Campus Survey of Parent Ombudsman Services* are general statements, such as "Counselor serves as parent ombudsman." In most of the entries, the staff member to whom the responsibility is assigned is identified, but not the services provided to parents.
3. Regarding free music lessons and instruments, the information presented in Table 5 is vague and hard to interpret. When comparing the entries with information found in Appendix C, Part II, a number of inconsistencies are noted. For example, statistics presented in Appendix C-Part II show 3 students enrolled in Kleberg as M-to-M transfer students however there's no entry in Table 5 for students participating in the free music lessons. Appendix C-Part II show 15 students enrolled in Degolyer. DeGolyer reports that "a few students have enrolled in band". Who are the "few" students?

Curriculum Transfer Program

The total number of curriculum transfers remained fairly constant for a number of years. However, in the past four years, this program has experienced a gradual decrease—from 680 in 1998-99 to 570 in 1999-2000 to 474 in 2000-2001 and finally, to 335 in 2001-2002.

The July 1994 Memorandum Opinion and Order Regarding Unitary Status required the continuation of the curriculum transfer program, and directed the district to use a separate application form in order to reduce confusion between the various transfer options. The district has complied with the Court's directive to utilize separate application forms.

The 1987 Annotated Amended Judgment allows the District to provide the curriculum transfer option to students who seek enrollment in special courses not offered in their home schools. The auditor has repeatedly questioned the legitimacy of some transfers in cases where the courses for which the students transferred were offered in their home schools. In past reports the district has contended that there is sufficient vigilance on the part of sending and receiving schools and the central office to verify the legitimacy of all transfers.

Review of data from Appendix D show that White students are more likely to participate in the curriculum transfer option than in the M-to-M program option. The trend data for grade configurations show:

High Schools

Jefferson sent the largest number of curriculum transfers for the past four years.

Adamson and W.T. White received the largest number of curriculum transfers for past four years.

Elementary Schools

Foster and Rogers Elementary school sent the largest number of curriculum transfers for the past four years.

Walnut Hill and Rosemont received the largest number of curriculum transfers.

Hotchkiss, designated as science emphasis school following the movement of the Montessori program to Dealey, continues to receive a large number of curriculum transfers.

Hardship Transfer Program

It appears that this program option is now showing a decrease in numbers after three years of moderate to dramatic increases. The 2001-2002 student enrollment (3631) decreased by 466 students, from the 2000-20001 enrollment of 4097. Data presented in Appendix E show the number of schools participating in the Hardship Transfer Programs has decreased steadily over the years due to space availability at individual schools. For the various grade configurations, the following trends are noted.

High Schools

Samuell and Spruce High Schools sent the largest number of hardship transfer students to other schools for the last four years.

Jefferson and Skyline received the largest number of hardship students for last four years.

Middle Schools

Browne and Hood sent the highest number of students for the last four years.

Atwell received the highest number of students for the last four years.

Elementary Schools

Blanton and Chavez sent the highest number of students.

Milam received a largest number of students for the last four years.

2.0 Magnet Schools

The magnet school budget information for 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 shows increases in all schools except Holmes Academy. The rationale for the budget decrease at Holmes was verified with the school principal.

Student Ethnic Distributions and Enrollments

The percent of 2001-2002 total student enrollment of individual vanguard, academy and magnet schools by ethnicity is presented. The action necessary for full compliance found in the *July 1994 Memorandum Opinion and Order Regarding Unitary Status* requires to district to “require the 32-32-32-4 ratio to govern the enrollment at all grades rather than just at the entry grade...to ensure that the enrollment remains consistent beyond the entry grade.” The enrollment by grade and ethnicity cannot be determined with the information presented in the 2001-2002 report. Data collected from the area superintendent and individual schools show:

Table 3
Magnet Schools Percent Enrollment of All Grades in 1994-95 and 2002-2003
(By Ethnicity)

BMC

1994 -1995 N=817					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	44	50	3	1	1
10	45	51	2	2	<1
11	48	48	2	2	0
12	54	44	2	1	0

2002-2003 N=454					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	43	46	4	7	<1
10	31	61	4	3	0
11	41	55	3	1	0
12	39	57	3	0	1

BTW

1994 -1995 N=690					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	33	18	48	1	1
10	25	17	56	1	1
11	29	19	49	2	1
12	39	21	38	3	0

2002-2003 N=712					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	26	27	42	3	2
10	29	26	44	<1	1
11	31	26	38	2	2
12	33	25	40	1	<1

ESSM

1994 -1995 N=129					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	56	37	7	0	0
10	62	28	10	0	0
11	64	29	7	0	0
12	67	33	0	0	0

2002-2003 N=210					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	37	50	12	0	0
10	39	46	11	3	0
11	27	63	8	0	2
12	49	46	5	00	

Table 3 cont.
Magnet Schools Percent Enrollment of All Grades in 1994-95 and 2002-2003
(By Ethnicity)

Health

1994-1995 N=686					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	57	27	8	8	1
10	57	27	10	6	0
11	56	25	11	6	1
12	55	23	12	10	1

2002-2003 N=502					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	42	41	9	7	<1
10	36	51	9	3	<1
11	48	41	5	6	0
12	53	38	5	2	2

Hum.

1994-1995 N=293					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	100	0	0	0	0
10	96	3	1	0	0
11	99	0	1	0	0
12	96	3	1	0	0

2002-2003 N=255					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	97	3	0	0	0
10	100	0	0	0	0
11	99	1	0	0	0
12	98	1	0	0	0

Law

1994-1995 N=327					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	56	35	7	2	2
10	61	19	19	0	1
11	67	11	18	2	2
12	72	26	2	0	0

2002-2003 N=377					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	45	47	5	2	1
10	41	43	13	1	1
11	49	42	8	1	0
12	36	62	0	2	0

Science

1994-1995 N=132					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	52	29	17	3	0
10	61	22	11	6	0
11	57	14	29	0	0
12	26	4	26	4	0

2002-2003 N=400					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	32	32	34	1	1
10	27	32	34	5	<1
11	37	35	24	2	0
12	32	34	29	3	1

TAG

1994-1995 N=141					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	32	28	36	4	0
10	32	14	43	11	0
11	35	13	39	13	0
12	39	16	39	6	0

2002-2003 N=162					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
9	23	30	40	7	0
10	32	34	29	5	0
11	31	41	27	0	1
12	33	31	31	5	0

Table 3 cont.
Magnet Schools Percent Enrollment of All Grades in 1994-95 and 2002-2003
(By Ethnicity)

Atwell

1994-1995 N=280					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	51	35	6	9	1
8	65	23	9	3	0

2002-2003 N=216					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	77	22	0	0	<1
8	81	18	<1	0	0

Dealey

1994-1995 N=137					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	30	31	33	4	1
8	34	25	37	3	0

2002-2003 N=151					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	30	37	27	5	0
8	27	43	25	4	0

DESA

1994-1995 N=171					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	35	36	26	1	1
8	31	33	34	1	1

2002-2003 N=165					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	38	54	6	0	1
8	39	45	11	2	2

Greiner

1994-1995 N=491					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	29	46	23	2	1
8	22	53	24	1	0

2002-2003 N=493					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	32	49	14	2	<1
8	30	55	11	2	<1

Holmes

1994-1995 N=253					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	68	28	3	0	0
8	81	19	0	1	0

2002-2003 N=197					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	78	20	2	0	0
8	74	25	1	0	0

Longfellow

1994-1995 N=364					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	36	39	19	5	1
8	37	34	23	6	1

2002-2003 N=395					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	29	59	9	1	<1
8	25	70	3	<1	0

Spence

1994-1995 N=145					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	29	25	39	7	0
8	39	20	34	6	1

2002-2003 N=153					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	32	57	8	1	1
8	30	49	18	3	0

Table 3 cont.
Magnet Schools Percent Enrollment of All Grades in 1994-95 and 2002-2003
(By Ethnicity)

Stone

1994-1995 N=112					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	38	28	33	0	2
8	55	25	14	6	0

2000-2001 N=114					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	43	41	13	1	0
8	38	40	16	2	2

Travis

2000-2001 N=181					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	47	15	32	5	0
8	32	32	32	3	0

2002-2003 N=195					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
7	31	34	31	1	2
8	32	40	24	3	1

Dealey

1994-1995 N=203					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	28	31	36	4	0
5	34	22	40	3	0
6	32	28	36	3	1

2002-2003 N=205					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	33	30	33	3	0
5	31	38	27	2	0
6	33	37	24	3	1

Jackson

1994-1995 N=270					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	67	29	4	0	0
5	69	29	1	0	0
6	75	21	1	3	0

2002-2003 N=147					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	44	54	2	0	0
5	57	38	3	2	0
6	72	22	6	0	0

Lanier

1994-1995 N=165					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	26	36	38	0	0
5	33	25	35	0	6
6	29	27	41	2	2

2002-2003 N=213					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	29	62	7	0	2
5	31	64	5	0	0
6	25	62	12	0	1

Polk

1994-1995 N=130					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	35	33	30	0	2
5	30	30	34	7	0
6	40	23	35	2	0

2002-2003 N=151					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	32	45	19	3	0
5	39	39	20	2	0
6	27	47	20	6	0

Table 3 cont.
Magnet Schools Percent Enrollment of All Grades in 1994-95 and 2002-2003
(By Ethnicity)

Stone

1994-1995 N=184					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	43	25	32	0	0
5	51	18	30	0	2
6	44	20	33	2	2

2002-2003 N=361					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	30	45	21	4	0
5	47	34	18	0	0
6	43	43	11	2	0

Travis

2000-2001 N=183					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	36	21	34	9	0
5	35	32	30	1	1
6	38	25	30	5	2

2002-2003 N=179					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	31	31	36	2	0
5	35	30	32	1	1
6	28	35	28	7	2

Twain

1994-1995 N=59					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	93	0	0	7	0
5	92	8	0	0	0
6	89	5	5	0	0

2002-2003 N=82					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
4	80	20	0	0	0
5	87	13	0	0	0
6	95	5	0	0	0

Dealey

1994-1995 N=191					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
PK	53	32	16	0	0
K	14	35	46	3	3
1	26	28	43	0	2
2	31	40	24	2	2
3	32	25	39	5	0

2002-2003 N=183					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
PK	29	25	37	3	3
K	35	32	28	3	0
1	29	32	32	2	2
2	24	37	33	2	2
3	26	36	32	4	0

Stone

1994-1995 N=208					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
PK	34	24	41	0	0
K	50	17	29	0	5
1	45	24	27	0	4
2	39	20	39	0	2
3	42	22	33	0	2

2002-2003 N=211					
	AA	H	W	As	AI
PK	44	32	23	0	0
K	47	23	26	3	0
1	40	36	23	0	0
2	40	31	25	2	0
3	44	21	22	0	2

The enrollment appears to fluctuate from year to year in most of the vanguards, academies and magnet schools as shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5 at 1-10 & 11. The data in the

tables are accompanied by notes detailing enrollment increases and decreases in individual schools. Whether the increase or decrease is related to demand (the number of applications received and student accepted) or the supply (number of slots available) is not explained. The missing information--the identification of the number of slots available in each school--must be provided before one can determine the district's ability to meet the demand. Upon the 1996 opening of Townview, initial enrollment caps were established for each of the magnet high schools. When those figures are compared with current statistics presented in Table 3 at 1-10, BMC, ESSM, Health and Law are below the proposed enrollment while Science/Engineering and TAG are above the proposed enrollment caps. The report does not account for the 75 spaces allotted for part-time students.

Numerical Demand

The district reports the number of application received for grades 4, 7 and 9 for the years, 1996-97 through 2002-2003. In order to make optimum use of these data in determining the draw of the magnet schools, collectively and individually, the report needs to include:

- ♦ the number of applications received by school, grade and ethnicity
- ♦ the number of slots available by school, grade and ethnicity
- ♦ the expected size of each of the schools

Recruitment, Admissions and Selection

The recruitment activities implemented by the Area 9 department and individual schools are described. Interviews with principals reveal that more schools have begun to develop events that draw prospective students and their campuses throughout the year.

The Court-approved admissions criteria are explained, including new practices designed to improve the objectivity of the process. From the individual school data submitted, most schools have sufficient applicants to fill the available slots evidenced by the

existence of waiting lists in seven of the eight high school magnets. With the exception of Communication/Humanities, the high school magnets have district students left on waiting lists albeit not all the underrepresented ethnicity groups are included.

The Court Order allows for the acceptance of students regardless of ethnicity at the end of the selection period which may account for a departure from the 32-32-32-4 ratio. However, the *1987 Annotated Amended Judgment* at 17 requires the district to report the number, ethnicity and race of students who have been admitted over the reserved student slots, as well as the steps taken to redress the imbalanced enrollments.

No information is presented in this report on the number of tuition students accepted to the magnets. The Court-approved procedures allow the consideration of out-of-district students on a tuition basis once district students have been served. Data collected show a significant increase in the number of tuition students enrolled in magnet high schools.

Table 4
Number of Tuition Students Enrolled 1992-93 - 2002-03

	BTW	BMC	ESSM	Health	Hum	Law	Science	TAG	Total
1992-93	43	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	50
1993-94	40	0	1	5	0	1	1	0	48
1994-95	52	1	0	1	0	1	4	0	59
1995-96	71	1	0	1	0	2	2	0	77
1996-97	65	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	69
1997-98	61	1	0	2	1	0	5	0	70
1998-99	53	3	1	0	1	0	4	1	65
1999-00	41	4	1	2	1	2	4	1	56
2000-01	36	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	50
2001-02	58	0	3	0	1	0	2	8	72
2002-03	90	0	3	13	1	0	0	0	107

Bold text indicates data from School personnel.

Staff Development

Although the report of staff development activities indicates that time was devoted to a review of elements of the Court Order, there is no indication that staff was engaged in

activities related to each cluster specialty. The continuous retooling of staff to adjust and improve the curriculum and instructional program are expected activities.

Teacher Characteristics

The overall picture of the teaching staff is presented in Table 7 at page 1-15. General attributes of the staff -- gender, ethnicity, education, experience and age are compiled for all the magnet schools. The information is needed by school in order to determine the attributes of individual school staff. Additionally, the preparation of staff to teach the specialty courses, the credentials held, is not discussed. The auditor, in response to the district's proposal to evaluate the specialty programs, has requested the review of staff credentials.

Achievement Outcomes of Magnet Students

Various statistics on the performance of students on *TAAS*, *Stanford 9*, *ACP*, *AP*, and *SAT* are provided. Comments regarding aspects of student performance not provided, or not clearly explained, include:

- ♦ *TAAS* Passing rates and TLI disaggregated by ethnicity to provide more closing the gap information
- ♦ Explanation of the N in Tables 10, 11, 12 on *Stanford 9* achievement for grades 4,5,6,7,8 and 9 students
- ♦ *Stanford 9* achievement by individual magnet schools, and by ethnicity
- ♦ More information on how the matched counterpart group for the *Stanford 9* was obtained
- ♦ Explanation of why 2000-2001 scores are compared with 1998-99 data
- ♦ Absence of 2001-2002 *ACP* data
- ♦ Variance in the number of *ACP* tests taken/offered by school - does the number relate to the number of courses offered at the school?
- ♦ Number of students taking *AP* courses at Townview (315) provided in Table 14 -- are these students enrolled in one of the six magnets? How does this number relate to the numbers given for each school?
- ♦ Explain the unusual set of statistics for the *AP* exams tests provided for the Lincoln Humanities Magnet.
- ♦ It appears that only two of three of the high school magnets perform better than the district on the *AP* examination.
- ♦ Table 15 data on *AP* examinations by ethnicity
- ♦ Comparison of *SAT* scores for magnet high school students with state and national average

Cluster-Related Outcomes of Magnet High School Students

The report on cluster outcomes is limited to brief descriptions of internship in five of the eight magnet high schools. The information is limited to the number and percent of students participating and the payment arrangements. The district does not comment on activities implemented in the three high schools where students do not participate in the internship experience. According to the report, advisory committees are functioning in all magnet high schools with varying degrees of participation. No information is provided on the type of activities implemented by advisory committees. No mention is made of advisory committees in the vanguard and academies.

Holding Power of the Magnet Schools

The holding power—a measure of the extent to which initially enrolled students remain in the same school for the expected two, three, or four years—is provided. Not provided, is a discussion of the reasons why some of the vanguards, academies and magnets are unsuccessful in holding the students. It would be helpful if data on the number of students leaving were presented by grade, ethnicity, and reason for leaving. Further, an analysis of the academic performance and achievement of the leaving students could be useful in determining how successful the schools are in serving the students chosen by the staff of each school.

College Attendance and Employment of Magnet School Graduates

The data in Table 17 represents only 319 graduates. The total number of magnet high school graduates is not provided. However, given the size of the N, the auditor questions the conclusions presented. The number of graduates contacted ranged between 8 and 80.

Proposal for the Evaluation of Specialty Programs

For a number of years, the intervenor and other district patrons have asked about the district's compliance with the mandate of the Court to "annually review the effectiveness of

all vanguard, academy and magnet high school programs through evaluations.” The Magnet School concept, initiated in 1976, had as its goal to prepare students to enter college or be prepared for entry-level employment in the magnet specialty area completed. To that end, the 1987 Annotated Amended Judgment at 15 C.2. requires the district to conduct an annual review of the magnet schools and to determine and implement appropriate changes to:

- ♦ ensure that all magnet schools are effective as educational tools and as desegregation tools
- ♦ alter curricula to attract greater numbers of racially diverse students
- ♦ close ineffective or irrelevant magnet programs
- ♦ improve existing magnet programs
- ♦ develop new magnet options

The district presents at 1-28 a proposal for the evaluation of magnet specialty programs. In response to an invitation from the district to provide input, the auditor submitted the following document.

External Auditor’s Response to the District’s Proposal for the Evaluation of the Magnet School Specialty Programs

The proposal for the evaluation of the vanguard, academy and magnet school specialty program submitted at page 1-28 identifies three components of the process.

I. The district proposes teams to include:

- ♦ magnet school personnel responsible for the specialty
- ♦ district personnel with qualifications to examine the relationship of the TEKS and the DISD curricula
- ♦ Outside consultants with qualifications to examine the personnel and the curricula of the specialty program (define the qualifications of the outside consultants)

The auditor suggests the following:

1. Develop a role for the vanguard, academy and magnet advisory committees in the evaluation process so that part of their annual charge is to examine the continued relevance of the curricula as it relates to developments in the industry/profession.
2. Establish baseline standards for governance-administration, personnel, curriculum and instruction, personnel development, and community involvement.

II. The district proposes that the evaluation will specifically examine:

- ♦ the specialty curriculum
- ♦ the relationship of the curriculum to the TEKS and DISD curriculum
- ♦ the qualifications needed by program personnel
- ♦ current developments in the specialty area identified by experts and personnel in the specialty area (this statement needs clarification)

The auditor suggests expansion of the evaluation to allow for the examination of:

1. the power of the curriculum and instructional program to attract a diverse student body
2. the credentials of program personnel—this is beyond teacher certification required by the district
3. the strategies employed for continuous retooling of staff
4. the extent to which the program prepares students for entry level employment (licensing and certification) or enrollment in a technical school or college to pursue the specialty program
5. the quality of the internships and other activities to ensure alignment with curriculum standards
6. the adequacy of the academic center to teach the high school curricula (required and elective) other than the specialty courses of the clusters

III. The district proposes that the teams will produce:

- ♦ specification of the main cluster curriculum and its components (e.g. cluster content)
- ♦ a comprehensive review of each cluster utilizing, but not limited to such sources as professional journals, information from professional associations, college syllabi, etc.
- ♦ content measurable curriculum standards for each cluster component
- ♦ a comparison of cluster content against the current standards

The auditor suggests the addition of the following:

1. an action plan for improvement of programs including processes for addressing specific items in the Court Order
2. alteration of curricula to attract greater numbers of racially diverse students
3. criteria for closing ineffective or irrelevant magnet programs
4. improvement of existing program via upgrading of the instructional program for all vanguard, academy and magnet schools
5. possible new vanguard, academy and magnet options
6. the development of a stronger role for the advisory committee
7. a comprehensive follow up study that identifies magnet graduates who continue in the specialty through employment or college/technical school study
8. the collection of opinions of students, parents and staff—through designed interviews and surveys (satisfaction scales, climate surveys, etc.)
9. expansion of vanguards, academies, and magnets by increasing slots in existing schools to meet demand.

In addition, the auditor requests the district revisit the organizational structure of the magnet high schools housed at the YA Ewell Townview

1. Clusters—Townview with one principal and six cluster leaders (deans, assistant principals) vs. six separate schools with six separate principals, etc.
2. Efficiency of six separate graduation exercises and UIL programs
3. Adequacy of the academic center to support the academic needs of all the magnet schools

3.0 Special Program for the Academically Talented Students

The TAG and Honors program is designed to encourage and nurture students who have been identified as talented and gifted by local school officials. Students considered for selection may be recommended by teachers, campus administrators, counselors, professional support personel, parents/guardians or they may be self-nominated.

The 1994 Memorandum and Opinion and the 1987 Judgment included cautions to the District regarding the operation of the TAG/Honors program:

- ♦ monitor the operation of the TAG/Honors program to ensure full compliance with the Judgment and other directives of the Court.
- ♦ monitor the objective and subjective elements of the selection process to ensure that no student or racial group is unfairly excluded, and
- ♦ modify, or eliminate any element of the selection process found to be discriminatory

Over time, issues and concerns have arisen that prompted the district to develop remedies to correct the identified issue or concern. One concern is the low participation of ethnic minority students in these programs. One remedy, developed by the district in 1995, was to ensure that the TAG/Honors program on each campus would include (1) a minimum of 12% of the total student population and (2) +/- 10% of the ethnic group represented in the campus enrollment. In 1998, the district eliminated the second part of the remedy (+/- 10%...) and replaced it with the statement, "Each program must strive to reflect the ethnicity of the entire student body in order to avoid the appearance of resegregation." The auditor expressed concern with this

vague statement in each of the annual reports since 1998 and asked for responses to 5 questions as a means of clarifying the district's intent. The district has yet to answer the questions. However, district officials *have* verbally committed to providing answers to the questions most recently found at 34 of the 2001 Annual Report of the External Auditor.

The operation of the TAG/Honors program at the elementary, middle and high school level, with respect to participation of ethnic minority students, was reviewed through the comparison of the TAG program participants (Appendix B) with the total school enrollment (Appendix A). Schools that show over-and/or under-representation of an ethnic group are presented.

Table 5
Analysis of Ethnic Representation in Pre-AP, Pre-Honors & TAG

Pre-AP Honors	AA	H	W	AS	AI
Adams, Bryan	↓	✓	↑	✓	✓
Hillcrest	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Kimball	↑	↓	✓	✓	✓
White, W. T.	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Wilson, Woodrow	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓

Pre-Honors	AA	H	W	AS	AI
Franklin, Benjamin	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Hill, Robert T.	✓	✓	↑	✓	✓
Long, J.L.	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Marsh, Thomas C.	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Spence, Alex W.	✓	↓	✓	✓	✓
Stone, Harry	✓	✓	↑	✓	✓

TAG (Middle School)	AA	H	W	AS	AI
Browne, T. W.	✓	↓	✓	✓	✓
Franklin, Benjamin	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Hill, Robert T.	↓	✓	↑	✓	✓
Long, J.L.	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Marsh, Thomas C.	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Spence, Alex W.	✓	↓	↓	✓	✓

Legend					
↓	Low	↑	High	✓	Okay

Table 5
Analysis of Ethnic Representation in Pre-AP, Pre-Honors & TAG

TAG (Elementary)	AA	H	W	AS	AI
Adams, Nathan	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Arlington	↑	✓	✓	✓	✓
Burleson	↓	↑	✓	✓	✓
Cabell	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Casa View	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
City Park	↓	↑	✓	✓	✓
DeGoyler	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Douglass	↓	↓	✓	✓	✓
Gooch	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Hexter	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Hotchkiss	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Jackson, Stonewall	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Johnston, Albert S.	↑	↓	✓	✓	✓
Kramer	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Lakewood	↓	✓	↑	✓	✓
Lanier	✓	↓	✓	✓	✓
Lisbon	↑	↓	✓	✓	✓
McMillan	↑	↓	✓	✓	✓
Macon	✓	↓	✓	✓	✓
Preston Hollow	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Reinhardt	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Rosemont	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Starks	↓	↑	✓	✓	✓
Tolbert, Thomas	↑	↓	✓	✓	✓
Walker	↑	↓	✓	✓	✓
Walnut Hill	✓	↓	✓	✓	✓
Webster	↑	↓	✓	✓	✓
Williams, Sudie	↑	↓	✓	✓	✓
Withers	✓	↓	↑	✓	✓
Young	↑	↓	✓	✓	✓

The auditor conducted site visits to Woodrow Wilson High School and its feeder schools (J.L. Long Middle School and Lakewood Elementary School) at the request of Board Member Ron Price. Findings include:

Observations

- ♦ visible separation of students by ethnicity in regular and TAG/ Pre-honors/ Honors/AP classes
- ♦ Regular classes tend to be much larger than TAG/Pre-honors/Honors/AP classes

- ♦ Regular classes tend to be composed of ethnic minority students
- ♦ The majority of teachers currently assigned to TAG/Pre-honors/Honors/AP classes are White
- ♦ The separation of students is visible in student electives and co-and extra curricular activities

Interviews with School Personnel

- ♦ elective choices of ethnic minority students (high school) tend to be in vocational programs
- ♦ AVID program introduced at middle and high school to increase the number of ethnic minority students in Pre-Honors/Honors/AP classes
- ♦ AVID students enrolled in Pre-Honors mathematics and language arts in middle school
- ♦ AVID students enrolled in Honors/AP biology and social studies classes in high school

Other Sources

- ♦ Publications (newspaper and yearbook) document the absence of ethnic minority students in many campus activities.

4.0 Programmatic Remedies

The district allocates \$10,385,950 in desegregation funds for distribution to schools in several categories: elementary schools and middle schools with student population of more than 75% ethnic minority; elementary schools with students scoring below the 40th percentile; and, high schools who lose 100 or more to magnet schools or M-to-M transfer program. Funds are also distributed to central office administration, multi-lingual department, and for tuition scholarships for M-to-M program participants. The funds are to be used to fund Programmatic Remedies—strategies to close the achievement gap between ethnic minority and white students.

The district reports the amount of funds distributed to and used by each school and departments; the categories (personnel, supplies and materials, personnel development, creative support) of expenditures by school or department; and the amount expended by May 31, 2002 by school and category.

Review of the information presented in the district's report reveal:

- ♦ The funds allocated are published through notice to principals during the budget cycle, and reported to the Court in the planning guide.
- ♦ Plans to spend the funds are published in the campus improvement plans, and approved by the area superintendents and the desegregation monitor.
- ♦ A process is in place to monitor the timely expenditures, so that students declared eligible during that year are the beneficiaries of the funds
- ♦ Recordkeeping at the campus level is much improved—based on the comparison of information in the district's reports and data collected in auditor site visits
- ♦ A record of expenditures is reported to the Court in the district's February and August Reports to the Court

The statements and statistics presented in this report regarding the narrowing of the gap, are offered without the support of essential details:

- ♦ Do the statistics presented represent the entire school population, or do they represent an unidentified number of students at certain grades?
- ♦ Do the statistics represent students who passed the TAAS at the minimum passing score of 70 percent correct, or do they represent students who reached the mastery level of 85 percent correct?
- ♦ Is student performance on nationally normed tests considered when making determinations about the narrowing of the achievement gap?

The Planning Guide

In the *September 16, 2002 Report to the Court-Part II* -The Planning Guide is described as an outline of the major efforts to close the achievement gap between ethnic minority students and White students. The formulae for the distribution of funds, brief descriptions of the major target groups receiving the funds, and the projected allocations are presented. Also included is an account of funds distributed and spent the previous year.

The planning guide is a fairly straightforward document that is relatively easy to understand and interpret. However, the following questions are submitted in order to get a full understanding of how the funds are allocated and used at various levels.

1. What is the rationale for the increase in allocations for the K9 (K, 5, 6) and S5 (LEP) and the decrease in allocations for J9 (1-4), M3 (7-8), M8 (9-12) and M-to-MI scholarships.

2. Why are there differences in funding from one year to the next, and differences in eligible schools?
3. Why was Skyline Center allocation set at \$25,000, even though there were 800 students shown as sending M-M or curriculum transfers?
4. Why is there no breakdown of excess cost funds for magnet schools (vanguard, academy and magnets) as there is for learning centers?
5. Why is there no explanation or discussion of funds budgeted in central office budgets, e.g., example, facility expenditures, transportation, minority recruiting, with resulting activities and accomplishments?

Reading Improvement

The district implements the Reading Improvement Program at grades 7-9 to remedy reading deficits of students scoring below the 40th percentile in reading comprehension. The *Corrective Reading* Program was begun in all middle schools and high schools (grade 9) by January 2002. The district reports that 14 schools use *Read 180* for students scoring below the 25th percentile.

The effect of participation on student performance (as measured on the *Stanford 9*) is displayed in Figures A, B, C and D and explained in the narrative at 167-171. Several conclusions are presented:

- ♦ Eligible students served in reading or reading improvement had higher scores than eligible students not enrolled in any reading class.
- ♦ Ineligible students incorrectly placed in reading improvement classes had the lowest mean scores.
- ♦ Eligible students had gains and ineligible students had losses regardless of their reading status.
- ♦ Grade seven students using the Corrective Reading had the lowest mean scores of any group.
- ♦ Grade 9 students using Read180/Corrective Reading had a much better chance of scoring higher.

The results are difficult to interpret without more information, including:

- ♦ explanation of the methodology and terms used in the figures
- ♦ definition of ineligible students

- ♦ explanation of how ineligible students are enrolled in the reading improvement course
- ♦ the total number of students enrolled in the reading improvement programs
- ♦ the number of students tested at each grade and by ethnicity

A review of the district's 2001 Report to the Court and the auditor's response showed similar problems in incorrect placement of ineligible students and significant achievement losses by eligible and ineligible student enrolled in reading improvement. The district expected the new curriculum to change the achievement trends—apparently it did not.

Title One

The district, in 2001-2002 received \$37,287,452 in Title I funds for distribution to 191 schools (21 high schools, 23 middle schools, and 137 elementary schools). Included in the count are 3 schools (Central, Turner, and Walnut Hill) that received targeted assistance grants. In addition, funds were distributed to 26 central office departments named in Table 2. The use for which the funds were expended is provided in Figures 4, 5, and Table 3. The information shows that instruction was the primary target for funds (63.3%). The information in the report is further refined to show patterns of use of funds in schools across school levels. Also provided is a report by schools and departments, of the unspent funds and a rationale for this together with explanation(s) for the failure to spend the total amount(s) allocated.

The assessment instruments administered to students served by Title I funds are introduced, along with a detailed explanation of what each instrument is expected to measure, and aids to assist the reader in interpreting the results. The instruments administered include:

- ♦ Measures of English Proficiency
 - Woodcock Munoz Language Survey (WMLS)*
 - Reading Proficiency Test in English (RPTE)*
- ♦ Norm Referenced Measures
 - Stanford 9*
 - Aprenda*

- ♦ Criterion References Measures
Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS)

Stanford 9

Table 4 displays the number and percent of student served who were administered a norm referenced test (*Stanford 9* or *Aprenda*). Included is an explanation of differences the number of students served in the charts, e.g. *Stanford 9* chart shows 425 White students served in 2001-2002 while the number served in the *Aprenda* chart is 300 (although no White students were tested with the *Aprenda*).

Table 5 presents the number and percent of students by ethnicity whose reading and mathematics scores fall in various percentile bands. The trend is downward for Hispanics and African Americans when results are displayed by ethnicity. For reading, more students score in the lowest percentile bands (1-25) and the fewest students score in the highest percentile bands (76-99). In mathematics, less than 30% of Hispanic and African American students score in the highest percentile bands, while more than 20% are in the lowest. The median percentiles for Hispanics and African Americans fall below those for all students—44 in reading and 56 in mathematics.

Table 6 presents the number and percent of students scoring by percentile bands by grade. In reading, the trend shows sharp declines in the number and percent of students in the highest percentile bands (76-99) from grade KN to grade 9—from 51% to 9.8%. Conversely, the number and percent of students scoring in the lowest percentile bands (1-25) increased from 11.5% to 37.3%. In mathematics, the decline is not quite so sharp, but the decrease in the number and percent of students in the highest percentile band (76-99) is significant—from 35.9 KN to 16.9 in grade 9. The data show a rise in the number of students in the lowest percentile bands. The median score in reading dropped from 78 KN to 34 in grade 9 while the

corresponding mathematics scores fluctuated—beginning at 64 in KN and ending at 47 in grade 9. The trend seems to indicate that Hispanics and African Americans continue to lag behind their peers and that the performance of the entire student population decreases as students proceed through the grades.

Gain scores for students taking the *Stanford 9* are presented in Tables 8 and 9 and in Figures 10 and 11. The conclusions presented include:

- ♦ Gains in reading were less at all grade levels in 2001-2002, except at grade 5.
- ♦ The percent of students who showed no gain (or negative gain) in reading was 50% across all grades—the range from 42.2 at grade 8 to 62.7 at grade 2.
- ♦ The percent of students who showed no gain (or negative gain) in mathematics was 45.2 across all grades—the range from 35.5 at grade 6 to 70.4 at grade 7.
- ♦ Grade 2 students experienced significant losses in academic growth in the past two years.
- ♦ In reading, elementary students in the lowest percentile bands (1-25) made the smallest gains while those in the highest percentile bands (76-99) made the largest gains.
- ♦ Conclusions drawn from classroom observations show that a large percent of reading time is spent on phonics—which is not emphasized on the *Stanford 9* reading comprehension test; students were engaged in skills instruction not related to reading comprehension; little time was spent on developmental writing; little was time spent on independent work time (suggested in the Open Court curriculum as time for teachers to work with students needing more reinforcement); very little higher order thinking; and, much time was spent on lower-level activities of the reading program with little emphasis on higher order thinking skills.

Apr enda

Achievement data for students administered the *Apr enda* are presented in Tables 10 and 11.

The data show

- ♦ At grades KN-2, more than 40% of the Hispanic students are ranked in the highest percentile bands (76-99) for reading and about 30% are in the highest bands in mathematics.
- ♦ Fewer Hispanic students are tested with the *Apr enda* in grades 3-6, and the percentages at each rank are somewhat evenly distributed.

Gain scores are displayed in Tables 11 and 12. The conclusions drawn include:

- ♦ The percent of students making no gains was highest at grade 3 in reading (57.2) and in mathematics (40).

- ♦ In both reading and mathematics, students in the lowest percentile bands made the largest gains while students in the highest percentile bands made the smallest gains.
- ♦ Gains made by low achieving students at grades 1 and 2 in reading, and at grades 1-5 in mathematics, represent the acceleration in achievement needed to move closer to grade level performance—a direct contrast to the same analysis for the *Stanford 9*.
- ♦ The curriculum used in the bilingual program may be more effective for lower achieving students, than the curriculum used with English-speaking students.

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS)

TAAS data are presented in Tables 14, 15, 16, and 17. The following conclusions are presented in the district's report:

- ♦ A higher percent of students of all ethnic groups passed the *TAAS* than in the previous year.
- ♦ The passing rate in reading ranged from 92.5% for White students, to 80.1% for Hispanic students.
- ♦ The passing rate in mathematics ranged from 91.7 % for White students, to 81.4% for African American students.
- ♦ The passing rate in writing ranged from 89.5% for White students, to 70.4% for Hispanic students.
- ♦ Data for the Spanish *TAAS* (in Table 16) are not comparable across years because of changes in testing policy.
- ♦ The percent of students passing *TAAS* increased since 2000.

Appendix B (the report of students who passed *TAAS* by school and subject area) is included in the report. However, Appendix K (which includes *TAAS* passing rates by grade and ethnicity for all schools) is missing.

Woodcock Munoz Language Survey (WMLS) and Reading Proficiency Test in English (RPTE)

Results of these two English Proficiency measures are shown in Tables 18 and 19.

- ♦ The *WMLS* results for grades KN,1 and 2 show that about 67% of the Title I students scored at level 3 (limited English) or above, with about 28% scoring at levels 4 and 5 (fluent and advanced English).
- ♦ The *RPTE*, used to assess growth in English proficiency and placement, showed the largest percent of students scoring at the beginning level occurred at grade 9. Most immigrant students entering high school are placed at grade 9 because they have not accumulated high school credits. The next highest percent of students at the beginning level occurs at grade 7.

5.0 Early Childhood Education

The Court Order requires the district to provide a comprehensive program of instruction in all areas based on the developmental needs of young children and the District's baseline curriculum program. According to the report, the district has (since October 2001) embarked on the task of developing an organized, systematic plan to restructure the Early Childhood Program; and has begun to implement and institutionalize the comprehensive program. The district maintains its intent to implement program components that meet the seven conditions listed in the Court Order.

With the exception of teacher training, the district's report does not include a direct response to the seven conditions of the Court Order. Instead, the reader is referred to various pages of the report to find information on compliance with the seven conditions. The auditor found this method of tracking the conditions of the Order in the program to be awkward and unproductive. In several instances, the same page reference is applied for unrelated actions and more than one condition. In other cases, the references were merely the mention of the condition in the context of the narrative and not related to how the condition is implemented. In summary, the auditor was unable to determine compliance from the written report. Discussions with district officials have been more productive. Pertinent information on how and what to document at the school level was presented during discussion with district officials. Verification of compliance, how it is accomplished and documented must be done in 2002-2003 campus site visits. Another positive step taken by the district is the revision of the Campus Improvement Plan format to include action steps for specific grade levels. However, the action steps for K-3 students in the samples reviewed do not include strategies that specifically address the 7 conditions in the Court Order.

A subset of staff development options designed particularly for K-3 teachers (from the vast list of offerings at 4-43-56) is provided in the report at 4-12-16. A review of the number of participants in each of the sessions offered shows that teachers were drawn to sessions on *Open Court* reading, *Everyday Mathematics*, and the *Dallas Writing Plan-Preparing Students for Success with TAKS*. Evidently there was substantially less interest in the social studies, science, differentiated instruction, strategies for teaching the at-risk child, guided reading, etc. A small number of options designed to help teachers to involve parents apparently did not attract teachers, either. Seemingly, there is no mandatory subset of staff development sessions geared to acquaint and train teachers on the components of the new plan. No training options for parents were found in the listings.

With respect to the comprehensive program, the district report is organized to present the general descriptions of the following:

1. Pre-Kindergarten Program

- Reading and Language Arts in Pre-Kindergarten

- Pre-Kindergarten Needs for Special Needs Children

2. Early Childhood Curriculum K-3

- Open Court Reading Plan

- Lectura* Reading and Language Arts Infusion in K-3

- Mathematics in K-3

- Science in K-3

- Social Studies in K-3

3. Talented and Gifted Program in K-3

Each of the components is described in detail, and is presented as a stand-alone curriculum in the report. However, the descriptions do not include information on how the Court-ordered seven conditions are specifically addressed.

In the past, the district produced a comprehensive program—where these components and the assessment instruments were part of an integrated instructional plan/guide for teachers. Plans of the past also included fine arts, physical education, and computer technology as integral parts of the comprehensive program. No descriptions of the curriculum nor of the methodology used to integrate these content areas into the comprehensive program are provided. Currently, district officials acknowledge that the total PK-3 comprehensive program is not complete, but is under development—beginning with grade 2 materials. Also reportedly under development is the corresponding assessment plan for the early grades.

The auditor confirms the district's assertion that development of the components of the comprehensive plan has begun. According to the district, the second grade materials are expected to be completed during the 2002-2003 school year. The timeline for the completion of the integrated plan of action for the other grades and the systematic implementation of activities related to the seven conditions, if identified, has not been publicized. The campus facilitators have been assigned and the training for facilitators and principals is underway. Three training sessions on documentation of the Court Ordered components are scheduled during 2002-2003. The effect of the training sessions, and the implementation of the comprehensive curriculum on individual campuses have yet to be verified in site visits.

Student Achievement

Student achievement results on the *Stanford 9* and *TAAS* are presented. For the *Stanford 9*, results are given for the combined K-3 population. Tables 2, 3, and 4 display student performance above the 40th, 50th, and 60th percentiles in reading. The district points out the significant gains for each ethnic group since 1994 and particularly since 2000-2001. It should be noted that the gains shown in 2000 were a recovery from the decrease at the 40th and 50th percentiles in reading in 1999. Tables 5,6, and 7 display the performance of grade 3

students on the *Stanford 9* at the 40th, 50th and 60th percentiles in mathematics. Again, the 2000 gains show a recovery from the 1999 drop. This drop is explained at 4-39 for the Hispanic group but not for African Americans and Whites. Again it should be noted that the data represent the combined K-3 achievement scores. Another set of statistics, the median percentiles for grades 1-3, is presented in Table 10. Here again, the substantial drop in reading achievement for all groups in 1999 is shown from which some groups have not or just barely recovered at grade 2. The presentation of the data by grade and ethnicity, and for the same grade groups, is needed to determine progress toward closing the achievement gap as students move up the grades and are confronted with more difficult and challenging materials.

The *TAAS* data presented in Tables 8 and 9 show substantial gains (since 1994) in the percent of African American and Hispanic 3rd graders passing reading and mathematics at the minimum passing level (70 TLI). The gap, however, is still in the double digits for African Americans in reading and mathematics and for Hispanics in reading.

Volunteerism in Early Childhood

The statistics on volunteers, and the discussion of community and parent involvement in the district, relate to district-wide and PK-12 efforts. No specific data are presented for PK-3 for volunteers used to address the 1:10 adult pupil ratio nor for the partnerships with entities serving young children. The one training session—held so far in 2002-2003—for campus facilitators and principals, included parent involvement strategies for early childhood teachers.

6.0 Bilingual Education and ESL Program

The district report includes an explanation of the series of new initiatives implemented in 2001-2002 at both the elementary and secondary level. Summaries of the state requirements are provided.

Staffing—the demographics and the difficulties faced due to teacher shortage, teacher turnover, and lack of certification—is sufficiently explained. Again, the auditor is compelled to recommend (in light of the growing LEP population and the severe shortage of certified teachers) the encouragement and/or requirement of ESL certification for the entire teaching force.

Student demographics, reported by the district, continue to document the rapid growth of the LEP population at both the elementary and secondary levels—41% of the elementary student population and 20% of the secondary school population are identified as Limited English Proficient. According to the report, not all identified students are served. Four schools, Urban Park, Saldivar, Maple Lawn and Preston Hollow have the largest numbers of students not served—above 100 in all cases. The length of time students are served by the program varies but students can continue in the program for seven years or more. Various tests are administered to identified LEP students

- ♦ *WMLS* and *RPTE* - to determine English proficiency (English acquisition)
- ♦ *Stanford 9*, *Aprenda*, and *TAAS* - to measure general academic achievement
- ♦ *ACP* and *EOC* - to measure course mastery at the secondary level

At 2-20, data are presented to show the progress of students toward English proficiency as measured by the *WMLS* and *RPTE*. The results are stated using rates of percent without identifying the numbers to which the percents correspond; thereby making it difficult to draw conclusions about the success of the instructional program in the acquisition of a second language.

The discussion of the effect of the ELI program is accompanied by a caution that it is premature to draw conclusions based on its first year implementation and one year's data. Again, the results presented use ratio of percent without the corresponding reference numbers.

Also student performance is compared with that of “Non-LEP” students. Is the term, Non-LEP, used to describe all district students not identified as LEP, or an identified comparison group?

For the *Stanford 9*, the brief statement in the narrative is limited to grades K-6, although median percentile scores are provided for KN-6 and 7-9. For the *Aprenda*, only a general statement about student performance is presented; no comparison of growth in 2002 is presented, although reference is made to the 2001 performance. With regards to *TAAS*, the results, again, are presented as a rate of percent passing, without any reference to the numbers tested. At page 2-24 in Figure 12, both Non-LEP, and District Total are used in the display of *TAAS* passing rates. How do these two statistics differ?

The *ACP* results are not presented. The information is limited to brief statements comparing LEP students in mainstream classes and sheltered classes. No statistics are presented to document the claims made.

The information on meeting exit criteria is a discussion of the student performance under a previous policy, and a comparison of current exit rates with those recorded 2000-2001. Again the number of students used in the analysis is unknown, in that all results are stated as the percent of students exiting.

The remainder of the BE/ESL report is devoted to discussion of performance trends for exited students and served students. Figures 15, 16, and 17 display the performance of students on *TAAS* in various subject areas by status—LEP, Exited LEP and Non-LEP for the period 1996-2002.

Determination of progress toward closing the achievement gap, for Hispanic and identified LEP students, is difficult without the following:

- ♦ the number of students who took the identified tests
- ♦ achievement results by grade and ethnicity compared with that of previous years

The results of a 1997-98—2000-01 cohort study that tracked identified LEP students for four years—from grade 9 to grade 12—showed that only 28% of identified students graduated in four years. During the four-year period, 60% of the students left the district. The results of the comparison group were only slightly better.

It appears—from the information presented in the district report—that it *is* premature to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the new curriculum, instructional arrangements and the resulting student achievement until the new program is implemented more than one year.

7.0 Learning Centers

Goal 1 - Climate

The district's report on learning center climate is concentrated on information from a 2001 survey on the districts recruitment, development and retention practices. The report is limited to teacher responses on training, job satisfaction, administrative leadership support and selection. No information is provided on what specific climate related information is covered in training sessions or how the knowledge gained is translated to the development and maintenance of a positive school climate.

The *1994 Learning Center Management Plan* clearly identifies the components to be implemented. Among them are the following elements which are not addressed in the district's report:

- ♦ a variety of student activities to promote academic excellence, competitive academics, community service, enrichment opportunities, athletics, aesthetics, school pride, and attendance
- ♦ high interest materials and sufficient supplies and resources
- ♦ staff development activities to gain knowledge to impact academic performance and social and personal development

- ♦ a community involvement program that establishes partnerships, and enhances positive home-school relations
- ♦ selected staff with successful experiences in developing positive climate
- ♦ counselor and social services staff responsible for using appropriate programs to enhance climate
- ♦ safe, clean well-maintained physical plant

Goal 2 - Student Self Perception

According the district report, learning center students are administered, annually, a survey which measures school learning environment, home learning environment, and academic self-concept. The district presents results of surveys administered from 1996 through 2002. The scales used in figures 1, 2, and 3, show the scale midpoint and the resulting scores for each these years. Notably the 4-6 centers scores are well above the midpoint. For the 7-8 centers, the scores representing student academic self-concept and home learning environment are above the midpoint. However, student assessment of the school learning environment has hovered around the midpoint for each of the seven years presented. In all cases, there appears to be some distance between where the centers are now and the ultimate goal (the top of the scale). For this reason, the auditor is perplexed by the conclusion presented by the district evaluator regarding student academic self-perception and the need for corrective action or improvement. According to the evaluator, "...survey indicators (like self-concept) denoted positive attitudes, so corrective actions were not taken." The claim of needing no corrective action would be more creditable if the district had presented convincing statistics to show (1) the effect of co and extra curricular activities on students; (2) the low incidence of violence (fights, assaults, disrespect of teachers, etc. in school); and, (3) the low number of students referred to alternative schools or to special education because of behavior as compared to non-learning center schools. Further, since student academic self-perception is a goal included in the Learning Center Management Plan,

it would seem that the annual campus improvement plan would include some objectives and proposed activities to address maintenance and improvement of the school learning environment, the home learning environment and the student academic self-concept by learning center personnel charged with this particular responsibility.

Goal 3 - Academic Achievement (Criterion -Referenced)

Achievement of students on the TAAS is reported in several formats.

1. Center and District TAAS Passing Rates

Passing rates of center students and other district students are compared for grades 4-6 and 7-8 for the period 1997-2002. In all cases, the trend shows significant improvement for learning center students when viewed along side the comparison group. The auditor needs clarification on the following points, not explained in the narrative.

- ♦ Although the phrase “passing rates” is used in the narrative, the phrase “percent mastery” is used to describe the vertical scales at figures 4-9--what is the correct term and how is it defined?
- ♦ Are the non-center students used as the comparison group a matched sample or are the center students compared with the district average? If it is a matched group, what factors are used to match? If ethnicity is used, can the results be divided by ethnicity? Also, can the results be reported by grade?
- ♦ Why are the statistics for White students omitted from the report. Comparison rates for center students, other district students, and district White students were presented in the 2001 and previous reports.

2. TAAS One and Five Year Passing Rate Gains

The passing rate gains are displayed in Table 2 with the explanation of the statistics presented. A note to the reader gives instructions for determining if the gains made by the center students are above or below the district average. The auditor requests clarification on the following:

- ♦ Does the term “other district students” used previously in Figures 4-9 mean the same as it does in Table 2?
- ♦ How do these gains relate to the closing of the achievement gap?
- ♦ Can these gains be presented by ethnic group and by grade?
- ♦ Are there any efforts to identify practices that produce the gains reported?

- ♦ Is there any evidence to refute the concerns regarding the absence of skill proficiency instruction in one identified learning center presented by parents at a school board meeting?

3. *Center and District TAAS Proficiency Rates*

The term “proficiency” is defined and the 2001-2002 comparison of center students vs. the district average is presented. The results indicate positive scores for 4-6 students in both reading and mathematics, and in mathematics for the 7-8 students for the year presented. Since the objective is to close the achievement gap, it would be helpful if the report provided more information--answers to questions, such as:

- ♦ What are the proficiency rates for 2001-2002 (and 2 years prior) by center, by grade and ethnicity?
- ♦ What is the proficiency rate goal for all district students in 2002-2003?
- ♦ What does the N represent—the number of students enrolled in the learning centers and district at the selected grade levels or the number tested? If it is the number tested, what percent of the enrollment does it represent?

4. *TAAS Remediation*

The district concludes, through the presentation of statistics, that the learning centers are more effective in the 4-6 centers in successfully instructing students who have failed the TAAS in both reading and math, and in mathematics in the 7-8 centers. Again, in the interest of closing the gap, it would be helpful to see the data presented by center and by grade and ethnicity. Again, the question about the identification of successful practices employed by the learning center staff is posed.

5. *The Goal of Narrowing the TAAS Achievement Gap.*

The district presents two statements to indicate the “narrowing” of the gap. The data from which this conclusion is made is noticeably absent from the report. It is interesting to note that this is the only instance where the district has not presented the data in a table or figure.

6. *TAAS Objective Performance*

The performance of students on objectives shown in Tables 6-10 is described as “mastery” rates. The performance of center students is compared to that of “other district students”.

The legend lists several codes not explained in the narrative.

- ♦ Bold - Does this mean “mastery” as synonymous with “proficiency” or does it represent ‘passing’ with 70% correct?
- ♦ What does the 55% represent?
- ♦ Does ‘other students’ refer to the district average?
- ♦ Can the rates be presented by grade, by ethnicity?

7. *TAAS Instructional Priority Summary*

It appears, from the information presented in Table 11, that the learning centers are experiencing difficulty with the problem solving-mathematics area at grades 4, 7 and 8 and in all areas tested in grade 8. How do these data relate to the instructional goals of the self-selected mathematics program operating in the learning centers?

Goal 4 - Academic Achievement (Norm-Referenced)

The district presents the performance on the *Stanford 9* of learning center students and other district students in Tables 12, and Figures 10, 11, 12, and 13. Again, the auditor questions what is not presented.

- ♦ Does the “other district students” represent a matched comparison group, or is it the district’s average?
- ♦ Can these data be presented by grade and ethnicity?
- ♦ Since the report is limited to cross sectional comparisons --what about cohort data usually presented for these tests (as in 2001 and previous years)?
- ♦ Why are the NCE scores presented for 2000 and 2001 in the 2001 Report to the Court different from the scores for the same years in the 2002 Report to the Court?

Replacement of Project SEED

The method of determining the effects of the replacement mathematics program was explained--along with a narrative explanation of the results. Obvious questions not addressed in the district's presentation include:

- ♦ What is the performance of Charles Rice Center as compared with the Centers where SEED was replaced?
- ♦ Why are these results presented using the School Effectiveness Indices (SEI) when none of the other performance results are presented in this manner?
- ♦ What are the performance differences when data are presented in performance on the TAAS and the Stanford Nine by grade and ethnicity?
- ♦ What do the numbers 4,562 and 12,789 at page 3-24 represent?
- ♦ Given that other data presented in this report indicate that mathematics performance, at least at grades 7 and 8 are often below the district average, on what basis does the district draw the following conclusion. "...the introduction of the Learning Center mathematics plans after Project SEED resulted in a significant increase in the already high mathematics School Effectiveness Indices in the Learning Centers."

Goal 5 - Non-Academic

The descriptions of the 15 components appear to be restatements of portions of the *Learning Center Management Plan* or references to portions of the plan.

Component 1 - Organizational Management

The meeting schedules and participants of specified groups are provided. References to the Principal's Compliance Checklist are made with reviews of two months—August and April (no year given). However, no reports of corrective actions taken are made. The *Learning Center Opening Day Status, 2002* (Table 6) lists far more areas of non-compliance than mentioned in the district's report. In particular, two centers reported non-compliance with the Student Cap of 20; three centers reported non-compliance in staff eligibility because of attendance; and, six centers reported shortages in instructional resources.

Table 6
Learning Center Opening Day Status 2002

Learning Centers	Student Cap. of 20	Staff Vacancies	Staff Eligibility	Condition of Facility	Instructional Resources
Anderson	Compliance	Sp. Ed.	3<3yrs exp. 7 AC	Complete	Compliance
Edison	Compliance	Reading Sp. Ed.TA	4<3yrs exp. 2 AC	Incomplete	Collective Math Science TE-7 th Science TE-8 th ESL LA/Math 7-8
Carver	Compliance	Sp. Ed.TA Office Clerk	2 AC	Incomplete	Compliance
Chavez	4 th Math	Compliance	3<3yrs exp.	Complete	Teacher Kits Kn-1 Journals 1-6
Dade	Compliance	2 nd Grade	1<3yrs exp.	Incomplete	Compliance
Dunbar	Compliance	Clerk Pre-K TA	Compliance	Complete	Compliance
Earhart	Compliance	Speech Therapist	5<3yrs exp. 3 AC	Incomplete	Compliance
James	Compliance	4-6 Fine Arts	Compliance	Complete	Compliance
Kennedy	5 th Grade Pod 4 sections	Bil-TA	3 attendance	Incomplete	K-3 Everyday Math
M. L. King	Compliance	Media Clerk	Compliance	Complete	Compliance
Martinez	Compliance	Media Clerk	6<3yrs exp. 3 AC	Incomplete	Everyday Math
Ray	Compliance	Compliance	Compliance	Complete	Compliance
Rhoads	Compliance	PE teacher TA	2 AC	Incomplete	Compliance
Rice	Compliance	4-6 Music	1 attendance 2<3yrs exp. 2 AC	Incomplete	Compliance
Sequoyah	Compliance	Compliance	5 attendance 8<3yrs exp. 2 AC	Incomplete	4-6 Math
Thompson	Compliance	Food Service Assts.	4<3yrs exp. 4 AC	Incomplete	6 th Spelling Kn-1 st Everyday Math TE

Component 2 - Instructional Organization

The organizational structure presented is as described in the Learning Center Management Plan. No information regarding the effectiveness of the organizational structure, or of the adjustments that have been or must be made is presented.

Component 3 - Instruction

The longest section (70+ pages) in the Learning Center Management Plan is summarized in two points in the report. The district presents a short report on grade 8 mathematics curricula and instructional method--with no information on how this relates to the evaluation of instructional goals in the management plan.

Component 4 - Staff Allocation

The staffing highlights presented at 3-27 are slightly different from the positions listed in the 1994 Learning Center Management Plan. A reference is made to the 2002-2003 Learning Center Operations Manual and a 1997 LCIP. Did the Court approve a management plan since 1994?

The ethnic breakdown of teachers is presented as well as a comparison of highest degree and experience (5yrs or less) of learning center teachers and non-center teachers. The management plan calls for the assignment of teachers with three or more years of experience, appropriate certification, performance evaluation above standard expectations, etc. These areas are not addressed in the report.

The district acknowledges non-compliance with the cap of 20 in all classes. However, no proposed corrective actions are mentioned.

Component 5 - Selection of Staff

As pointed out in the previous section, the management plan calls for the assignment of teachers with three years or more experience. Nine of the centers, in the Opening Day Status Report, reported non-compliance in this area. Whether all assigned teachers have the appropriate certification, or the most recent evaluation level required, is not addressed. Also not addressed is staff stability--the management plan requires a three-year commitment for staff. A segment of the management plan requires the district to develop, and submit to the

Court staff selection and established timelines—with a notice (10 days) to the Court if the district is unable to meet the established timelines. This segment of the Court Order has been in non-compliance status for several years.

Component 6 - Incentive and Supplemental Pay

The district report is limited to naming the designated positions that receive supplemental pay for extra duty. For the incentive (performance) goal, the district reports goal attainment for each center for the period 1994-2002. Attainment of academic goals is not separated from non-academic goals, therefore it is not possible to tell how each center is progressing toward achievement goals. Some centers appear to have regressed in the percent of goals attained, when current data are compared with previous data.

Component 7 - Guidance, Counseling and Social Services

Excerpts from the management plan are presented here without the support of documentation of implementation of activities from the list provided in the management plan.

Component 8 - Student Activities

The report contains a brief description of the student activities required in the management plan. The reader is referred to the individual learning center for documentation.

Component 9 - Instructional Resources

The report contains a brief description of the resources required in the management plan. The reader is referred to the individual learning center for documentation. The Learning Center Opening Day Status Report by principals shows six centers are missing some of the required instructional resources.

Component 10 - Staff Development

The report contains a brief description of the staff development required in the management plan. The reader is referred to the individual learning center for documentation.

Component 11 - Parent/ Community Involvement

The report on parent and community involvement is limited to the activities of the community liaison taken from a survey administered annually. There is no summary report on the program implemented from the proposed activities provided in the management plan.

Component 12 - Facility Maintenance/Safety and Security

The district reports the current status of learning center repairs. However, the April 2002 Facilities Report includes more unfinished projects than addressed in the district's report. Contrary to the district's report that no learning centers have outstanding projects submitted in 1997 and 1998, the April report includes one 1997 project at Thomas Edison and one 1998 project at Charles Rice. In addition, the Learning Center Opening Status Reports submitted by principals show ten centers with incomplete projects.

Component 13 - Transportation

The report outlines the requirements for transporting students from specified feeder schools—as noted the management plan. There is no information on the special transportation for before/after school programs and cultural events, or for the transportation for parents, and special education and or BE/ESL students.

Component 14 - Evaluation

The district report includes a list of evaluation reports submitted to the Court from 1985 to the present. Although this is good information, it appears that this section of the management plan provides guidelines for the annual evaluation process. Specifically, it calls for information and data collected from observations of center activities, results of various surveys with information on changes; and responses to concerns, or potential problems. There are specific questions to be addressed in the five goal areas—through an internal monitoring system that goes beyond the principal's checklist now available.

Component 15 - Budget

The district provides a brief report on excess cost which fails to give details of what positions and services are designated “excess cost”. Five centers and one area of the central budget show decreases from 2001 without a rationale for the decrease.

Some essential items provided in previous report but omitted from this report include:

- ♦ the comprehensive report of student demographics by center, grade and ethnicity
- ♦ the distribution of students by center and special population (Special Ed., TAG, BE/ESL, retained, at-risk, etc.) compared to district-wide distribution
- ♦ administrator and teacher demographics by center, by gender and ethnicity, including certification and longevity information
- ♦ results of teacher climate survey, administrators’ survey, and student self-perception survey, with change data and a report of activities planned and implemented
- ♦ the excess cost figures by center--for several years--with student enrollment data included

8.0 Facilities

The projects mandated by recent Court Orders include:

Bond Program

- ♦ Completion of Townview Magnet Center
- ♦ Completion of Chavez, Kennedy, and Ray Learning Centers

The building of these facilities was accomplished with the 1992 bond program

Magnet Schools

- ♦ Comparability of Polk, Spence and Travis Facilities
- ♦ Comparability of Walker and Maynard Jackson Vanguard Facilities and Program
- ♦ Purchase of equipment and materials and completion of associated renovation projects with funds from the Crozier Tech property sale
- ♦ Continued priority maintenance and repairs of magnet school facilities

The comparability issues existing between Walker and Jackson were resolved with the development of science laboratories and the upgrade of the technology laboratory at Jackson.

The comparability of the Polk, Spence and Travis facilities is in various stages of completion. The addition of modular portables on the Polk campus has been delayed (with community approval), and will be a priority in the upcoming bond program -- a 16-room addition.

The district reports that the Crozier Tech funds are fully expended. District officials verbally reported that the processing of requisitions is complete for the final items requisitioned by schools and the expected use of any remaining funds on replacement of equipment and repair of renovated space at the Lincoln Communities and Humanities Magnet (damage from a flooded space in August, 2002). Verification of the last expenditures and the receipt of requisitioned equipment has yet to be monitored by the auditor in site visits.

The continued priority maintenance and repairs of magnet school facilities is behind schedule--with twenty-six projects scheduled for completion by August 2002 still pending or incomplete.

- Two repair projects--initially reported in April 1997, and scheduled for completion in August 1998--are incomplete.
- One repair project--initially reported in April 1998, and scheduled for completion in August 1999--is incomplete.
- Two repair projects--initially reported in April 1999, and scheduled for completion in August 2000--are incomplete.
- Five repair projects-- initially reported in April 2000, and scheduled for completion in August 2001--are incomplete.

Learning Centers

- ♦ Continued priority maintenance and repairs at the 16 learning center sites.

The continued priority maintenance and repairs of learning center facilities is behind schedule—with thirty-eight projects scheduled for completion by August 2002 still pending or incomplete.

- One repair projects- initially reported in April 1998, and scheduled for completion in August 1999--are incomplete.

- Three repair projects--initially reported in April 1999, and scheduled for completion in August 2000--are incomplete.
- Eight repair projects--initially reported in April 2000, and scheduled for completion in August 2001--are incomplete.

The district has asked the Court to be relieved of the responsibility for considering the maintenance and repairs at learning centers a priority action. District officials contend that the Court Order limited this priority status to a June 3, 1994 checklist. In the absence of this required action, maintenance and repair requests of the learning centers (and magnet schools) would be a part of the regular maintenance schedule for all other schools. The obvious questions are:

- ♦ What happens to 65 projects identified in Learning Centers scheduled for completion in August 2003?
- ♦ What happens to 48 projects identified in Magnet Schools scheduled for completion in August 2003?
- ♦ Is there a schedule where maintenance and repair needs are handled annually?
- ♦ If not annually, how often are the needs of individual schools addressed?
- ♦ The funds for learning centers and magnet schools are annually budgeted. Will the district established a budget to address these needs for learning centers (and magnet schools)?

9.0 Personnel and Training

The district describes its professional employees in five categories--(1) teachers, (2) school administrators, (3) other professional (4) central administrators, and (5) technical personnel. The discussion of compliance is, however, limited to two of the five categories--teachers and school administrators (principals, deans of instruction, assistant principals). The compliance standard for teachers is the 75/25 Faculty Diversity Plan. The compliance standard for campus administrators is the Singleton Ratio. The district does not provide in the February 15, 2002 Report to the Court (or previous reports) information or discussion of the Court-ordered 40-40-20 ratio which should govern recruitment and assignment of personnel in the remaining three categories--other professionals, central administrators, and technical

personnel. Concerns regarding the continued absence of data showing compliance or progress toward compliance, with this mandate of the Judgment, are presented in detail, in the July 15, 1996 Annual Report of the External Court Auditor-Part I. The reader is referred to that document for an understanding of the basic concerns registered. For the record, the February 15, Report to the Court shows the district at variance with the 40-40-20 mandate for technical personnel and other professionals.

In keeping with the Court-ordered 75/25 faculty diversity plan for teacher assignments, the district is required to hold monthly waiver committee meetings. During the 2001-2002 school year, meetings were held whenever there was a need to consider waivers for any schools. For the year, 53 schools (found to be out of compliance) requested and were granted waivers for the remainder of the school year.

The data on the assignment of school administrators by ethnic composition according to the Singleton Ratio are presented in Table 24 of the February 15, 2002 Report to the Court. The district reports 211 schools and 505 assigned school administrators in the 2001 report, as compared with 208 schools and 504 assigned administrators in the 2002 report. No explanation is provided for the reduced number of schools.

The district's conclusions on the assignments are

- ♦ in compliance with the Court-Ordered Singleton Ratio (within the allowable range of +/- 15 %,) for schools in Group 4 (75% minority students) and Group 5 (desegregated)
- ♦ out of compliance with Court-Ordered Singleton Ratio for schools in Group 1(75% Black students) and Group 2 (75% Hispanic students.)

The 1987 Annotated Amended Judgment directs the district to continue to make diligent efforts to recruit, retain and certify qualified Black and Hispanic teachers. In March, 1997, the Court approved the District's Minority Recruitment Plan for Teachers. The

Planning Guide at page 16 shows \$225,065 (as of May 31, 2002) expended for this purpose with no information presented on the activities, and/or resulting success of the program.

Training

Training of staff and parents is addressed in numerous instances in the *1987 Annotated Amended Judgment* and the *July 1994 Memorandum Opinion and Order Regarding Unitary Status*, as well as in individual Orders issued from time to time. The reader is referred to the September 22, 2001 Auditor's Report for more information on the required training. The district does not, in the 2002, or any previous report, present a comprehensive report of staff and parent training. Isolated reports of training are found in various reports, e.g., the Early Childhood Education report includes a list of training options for teachers, and the BE/ESL report refers to teacher training by the Multi-Language Department. District officials maintain that new emphasis is placed on training of principals on compliance with the Court Order, by a part-time consultant recently hired. No information on required parent training is provided in reports reviewed.

The auditor submits the following questions, and requests additional information:

- ♦ With the elimination of the African American and Hispanic Advisory Committees, how will these segments of the community be represented in the waiver committee hearings?
- ♦ The total number of school administrators (510) shown in Table 23 differs from the number assigned to schools (504) shown in Table 24--which figure is accurate?
- ♦ Why is there a difference in the number of schools reported in 2001 and 2002?
- ♦ What is the assignment ratio and compliance status--when only school principals are considered?
- ♦ Where can information on the activities implemented, and the resulting success of the efforts of the Minority Recruitment Plan be found?
- ♦ Where can documentation of parent training in the areas cited in the various Court Orders be found?